

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed June 8, 2006 and Advisory Action mailed August 29, 2006. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 11-23 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 11-23 stand rejected. Claims 6, 7, and 10 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 13, 14, 16, and 20-23 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 13-17, and 19-23 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent No. 1,083,599 filed by Georg Fromme et al. (“Fromme”). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art as anticipatory by the Examiner cannot anticipate the rejected Claims, because the cited art does not show all the elements of the present Claims.

The Examiner explained in the advisory action his interpretation of the term “in between.” Even though Applicant still disagrees with this interpretation, Applicant amended the independent claim to clarify that the connecting elements are arranged between adjacent substrates as shown in the Figs. of the present application. The main prior art Fromme used in the recent rejection clearly does not show such an arrangement. On the contrary, according to Fromme, the connecting elements are arranged above the substrates and are not coplanar with the substrates.

Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent Claims are allowable at least to the extent of the independent Claim to which they refer, respectively. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the dependent Claims. Applicant reserves the right to make further arguments regarding the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), if necessary, and do not concede that the Examiner's proposed combinations are proper.

Request for Continued Examination

Applicant respectfully submits a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal, and hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge the appropriate filing fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) to Baker Botts L.L.P. Deposit Account 50-2148.

Petition for Extension of Time

Applicant respectfully submits a Petition for One-Month Extension of Time, and hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge the appropriate filing fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(1) to Baker Botts L.L.P. Deposit Account 50-2148.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicant believes there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney, Andreas H. Grubert at 512.322.2545.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicant



Andreas Grubert
Reg. No. 59,143

Date: October 9, 2006

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **58174**
512.322.2545
512.322.8383 (fax)